

# KANSAS MUST BE FREE!

## THE POLITICAL EFFECTS OF SLAVERY

Vol. 5-

### SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY BENNETT, OF NEW YORK,

ON THE BILL

FOR THE ADMISSION OF KANSAS AS A FREE STATE,

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 30, 1856.

1

The House having under consideration House bill (No. 411) for the admission of Kansas as a free State,—

Mr. BENNETT, of New York, said:—

Mr. SPEAKER:—Kansas asks admission as a free State. This is demanded for the protection of her people and the preservation of the public peace. It is required by every consideration of justice and of prudence. Kansas was a free Territory and pledged to freedom. But the last Congress did the great wrong of opening it to slavery; unsettling that which was settled; reopening slavery agitation, and renewing sectional strife; violating the national faith, and doing injustice to the free States.

By that act Kansas has been made the theatre of contention and violence. Printing-presses have been torn down, property destroyed, houses burned, and robberies and murders committed. The Territory is in a state of civil war. Mobs of armed men, controlled only by the madness of passion, have inflicted upon peaceable citizens every kind of indignity and insult, and perpetrated every species of crime and cruelty, unchecked and unrebuked. It has no law or government protecting its citizens; none, or such only as has been imposed upon them,—such only as tends to their oppression. The city of Lawrence has been destroyed, and free citizens driven from the Territory, with the sound of artillery ringing in their ears, and the light of their burning habitations flashing upon their eyes, as

they turned to look back to the homes where they had been forced to leave their wives and children at the mercy of worse than barbarian foes.

In this condition of things, when the public feeling has become highly inflamed and we are rapidly approaching revolution, we are appealed to for the admission of Kansas as a State, to give safety to its people, and prevent further outrages; to restore peace and tranquillity to the country, such as it had before this wicked attempt was made to force slavery into free territory. Its admission as a State has now become a matter of imperious necessity. It is the only way left of peaceably and speedily putting an end to all these difficulties. It should be at once adopted. What objection can be made to the immediate admission of Kansas? Its constitution is republican, and was fairly adopted. Its precise population is immaterial. There is no regulation on that subject. It rests entirely in the discretion of Congress. It is estimated that Kansas has now some sixty thousand inhabitants, and their numbers are rapidly increasing. Long before another election, it will have double the number deemed necessary by any objector. No delay is necessary on this account. Seven States have been admitted, having, when they applied for admission, a less population than Kansas is now estimated to have.

Neither Missouri, Arkansas, nor Louisiana, —all slave States, admitted from the same

This Speech may be had at the office of the "Philadelphia Morning Times," No. 47 South Third St., at the rate of One Dollar a hundred for any quantity.

J. BARCLAY HARDING.

Territory,—had as large a population as Kansas has; and Florida, another slave State, had, when admitted, only twenty-seven thousand and ninety-one inhabitants, and, by the last census, had only forty-seven thousand two hundred and three free white inhabitants; yet Florida, for more than ten years, has had its two Senators in the Senate of the United States, representing in 1845 twenty-seven thousand, and in 1848 forty-seven thousand people:—equal in the Senate with New York, having over three millions!

Is it wise or proper to refuse admission to Kansas, and protection to its people, in the hope of yet being able to make it a slave State? That, I believe, is now impossible. As such it never can be admitted; it is doubly pledged to freedom. But if its people, now asking admission as a free State, desires to establish slavery, they can amend their constitution at any time after their admission as a State to that effect, and in that way, and in no other, make it a slave State. And even for this purpose, (really the only objection,) no delay is necessary, and nothing can be gained by it.

I propose to compare the claims of the two sections to Kansas, and see to which it rightfully and properly belongs; to see how much our purchased territories have cost, and how they have been divided.

## I.

## COST OF TERRITORY PURCHASED.

Territory of Louisiana (purchased of France in 1803).....	\$15,000,000
Interest paid.....	8,327,353
Florida (purchased of Spain).....	5,000,000
Interest paid.....	1,430,000
Texas (for boundary).....	10,000,000
Texas (for indemnity).....	10,000,000
Texas (for creditors, last Congress).....	7,750,000
Indian expenses of all kinds (say).....	5,000,000
To purchase navy, pay troops, &c.....	5,000,000
All other expenditures.....	3,000,000
Expense of the Mexican war.....	217,175,575
Soldiers' pensions, and bounty-lands, &c. (say).....	15,000,000
Expenses of the Florida war (say).....	100,000,000
Soldiers' pensions, bounty-lands, &c. (say).....	7,000,000
To remove Indians, suppress hostilities, &c. (say).....	5,000,000
Paid by treaty for New Mexico.....	15,000,000
Paid to extinguish Indian titles (say).....	100,000,000
Paid to Georgia.....	3,082,000
	<hr/>
	\$532,764,925
	<hr/>

Many of the above items can be accurately stated; others can only be estimated. But our acquisitions of territory have cost us an immense amount, and led to large expenditures. The above is merely an approximation towards it. The expense of the Mexican war is given as stated officially by the Secretary of the Treasury in his report in 1851. (See Appendix to Globe, vol. 23, page 21.) This was, as Mr. Clay said in his great speech in 1850, a war "made essentially by the South, growing out of our annexation of Texas;" a

war into which the country was precipitated by the action of a Southern President; a war of conquest, which Congress declared "was unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President of the United States."

It was at the instance of the slaveholding section of the Union, and for its immediate benefit, that all our purchases of foreign territory have been made. It was most emphatically the South, and the voice of "Southern councils," that led to the acquisition of Louisiana, Florida, Texas, and New Mexico; and as it regards all sectional issues—all questions of political ascendancy—all these acquisitions of territory have been made, and have operated, for the direct and immediate benefits of the slaveholding States.

*Not one inch of territory has ever been purchased or acquired of any foreign Power, since the Constitution was adopted, at the instance of the free States, or which was intended for their benefit!*

Yet the free States have paid more than two-thirds of the entire cost of all these acquisitions of territory, and the consequent expenditures since incurred. They have borne their full share in the wars which led to, or resulted from, these acquisitions, in the expenditure of money and in the sacrifice of human life.

## II.

## HOW HAS THE PURCHASED TERRITORY BEEN DIVIDED?

From the territory thus purchased and paid for by all the States, *five new slave States* have been admitted, having the following extent of territory and representation in Congress:—

States.	Square Miles.	Senators.	Representatives.
1. Louisiana.....	41,246	2	4
2. Missouri.....	65,037	2	7
3. Arkansas.....	52,191	2	2
4. Florida.....	59,268	2	1
5. Texas.....	325,369	2	2
5 Slave States.....	543,111	10	16
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

*The free States, from this territory, Kansas and Nebraska, are yet to be admitted, unless the unjust legislation that opened these free Territories to slavery, and the violent measures adopted to establish it in Kansas, aided and abetted by the present Administration, shall enable slavery to take all, even that part once secured to freedom, and from which slavery was "forever prohibited!"*

At a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars, (over eight hundred millions,) we have obtained the territory for these *five new slave States*, by which the slaveholding section have gained *politically* (and that is the all-important object) *ten United States Senators and sixteen members of this House!*

California, it is true, has been admitted as a free State; but it was the result of accident. The territory acquired of Mexico, like all the rest, was acquired for the benefit of the South. The discovery of the mineral wealth of California led to its rapid settlement and admission as a State before slavery had time to be transplanted there. The Senators and members from California have learned in whose hands the power of this Government is held, and have ever been, and now are, politically, the faithful allies of the South. They have ever been—they are now—of the pro-slavery party. And in the account I am stating between freedom and slavery, California should be wholly omitted, as it forms no part of the territory where the struggle for and against the extension of slavery has been carried on. Omitting, then, California on either side of the account, I proceed:—

Out of all the territory purchased since the Constitution was adopted, how many free States have been admitted? *None!*\*

How many Senators have the free States gained by the large expenditure of blood and treasure they have made? *None!*

How many Representatives? *None! no, none! not one inch of territory, not one solitary member in either branch of the National Legislature!*

Mr. Clay admitted this, in his speech made in the Senate in 1850. (See Appendix to Globe, vol. 22, part 1, page 126.) He said,—

“What have been the acquisitions made by this country, and to what interests have they conduced? Florida, where slavery exists, has been introduced. All the most valuable part of Louisiana has also been added to the extent and consideration of the slave-holding portion of the Union. All Louisiana, with the exception of what lies north of 36° 30’.

“All Texas; all the Territories which have been acquired by the Government, during sixty years of the operation of that Government, have been slave Territories—theatres of slavery—with the exception I have mentioned lying north of 36° 30’.”

It is no longer an exception! Even there slavery was admitted by the last Congress.

But were the free States to receive no part of the purchased Territories? Yes. The South made a division, by which the free States were promised that part of the Louisiana Territory lying north of 36° 30’, when, in the then distant future, it might be settled. But when, more than thirty years afterwards, that time came, the slaveholders *abused* the power which the free States had given them, by this addition of ten Senators and sixteen Representatives, and violated every principle of honesty and good faith, by repealing that pledge and repudiating that promise; claiming a perfect right to all they had obtained, and an equally perfect right to take the rest, even that small

portion which was free and which they had pledged to freedom. And the President and pro-slavery party are now labouring to force slavery upon Kansas, by outlawing and butchering the citizens of Kansas opposed to slavery. Thus far, the *fair division* of the Territories purchased and paid for by all the States, has been—to the free States, *none!* to the slave States, *all!* But that is not enough; even that comparatively valueless part of the Louisiana purchase lying north of the Missouri Compromise line, of which Mr. Clay said, in 1850, “In point of intrinsic value and importance, I would not give the single State of Louisiana for the whole of it,” is demanded by the aggressive spirit and sectional interest of slavery.

To this the free States never can consent. Kansas and Nebraska never should, and never can, be admitted as slave States. Never! Do not increase the evils that are upon us, and protract this controversy in that vain hope. It never can be realized. The question is not now as it was in the beginning. But for these great additions of territory, which the free States aided to purchase; but for these new slave States, formed out of the added territory, which the free States aided to admit; but for the votes of the Senators and Representatives from these very States, thus acquired and thus admitted, this great wrong of opening the free Territories to slavery—a wrong against the *political and equal rights* of the free States—could never have been committed. Without the aid of the votes of the new slave States, the slave power could not have violated the compact of 1820. Our past experience can never be forgotten. The day of compromises is passed. We have learned that the slave power aims at supremacy—*absolute supremacy—in this Government*; that it is ever aggressive, insistent, and exacting; that it abides by no compact, fulfils no promise, regards no obstacle, but, true to one instinct, its love of dominion, seeks to secure the whole power of this Government in its grasp. It seeks to destroy the political rights of the free States, to trample under its feet every principle of equality and of republicanism and build up its own power upon their ruins. Against this perversion and destruction of the very principles of this Government the free States here, and now, have taken their stand, seeking only to bring back the Government to the true republican standard of *equal representation and equal rights*.

The great question now is “the extension or non-extension of slavery:”—*its extension into free territory* and then its extension into the free States, for one is the same as the other. “It controls the South. It controls the North. It precludes escape.” So say the pro-slavery papers. True. It cannot be avoided or evaded. We are compelled to meet it, whether we would choose or not.

\*It is claimed that Iowa, at least, was a part of the Louisiana purchase. If it were conceded, it would not weaken my argument. But it is also claimed, and I think more correctly, that it was a part of the territory north and west of Ohio, ceded by Virginia, (and the other States,) and from which slavery was excluded!

On this question there are but two parties:—those who are for the extension of slavery into the free Territories and those who are against it. It is the great question, before which all others sink into insignificance. Are we to have a government of the people, a real representative Republican Government? or are the owners of slave-property, small in number, but with the power now in their hands, and strongly intrenched in every department, to rule us with arbitrary and undisputed sway? Is this to be a land of freedom, or a despotism of slavery? Is such a despotism, more odious than any that can be found in history, to be now firmly fixed upon us, by a system of fraud and force,—by high-handed acts of wrong, outrage, and violence? Shall Freedom, Democracy, and Republicanism, be crushed down by the despotic rule of slavery? Shall *one interest, one section, one institution*, be made absolutely the *ruling power*? or are all interests to be alike represented and alike protected? It is a question not only for the present, but for all future time! Let freemen judge? *Are you for or against the extension of slavery?* This is the question—the great question—to be settled at the next Presidential election! *Are you for or against the extensionist of slavery INTO FREE TERRITORY? For slavery or for freedom?*

### III.

#### EXTENT, POPULATION, AND REPRESENTATION OF THE FREE AND SLAVE STATES.

<i>Free States.</i>	<i>Sq. Miles.</i>	<i>Population.</i>	<i>Sen.</i>	<i>Rep.</i>
1. New York.....	46,000	3,048,325	2	33
2. Pennsylvania.....	47,000	2,258,160	2	25
3. Ohio.....	39,964	1,956,050	2	21
4. Massachusetts.....	7,250	985,450	2	11
5. Indiana.....	33,809	977,154	2	11
6. Illinois.....	55,409	846,034	2	9
7. Maine.....	35,000	681,813	2	6
8. New Jersey.....	6,851	465,509	2	5
9. Michigan.....	56,243	395,071	2	4
10. Connecticut.....	4,750	363,099	2	4
11. New Hampshire.....	8,030	317,456	2	3
12. Vermont.....	8,000	213,402	2	3
13. Wisconsin.....	53,924	304,756	2	3
14. Iowa.....	50,914	191,881	2	2
15. Rhode Island.....	1,200	143,575	2	2
<b>Fifteen States.....</b>	<b>454,344</b>	<b>13,147,035</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>142</b>

(Omitting California, as before.)

<i>Slave States.</i>	<i>Sq. Miles.</i>	<i>Population.</i>	<i>Sen.</i>	<i>Rep.</i>
1. Virginia.....	61,352	894,800	2	13
2. Kentucky.....	37,680	761,413	2	10
3. Tennessee.....	44,000	756,834	2	10
4. Missouri.....	65,037	592,004	2	7
5. North Carolina.....	45,500	553,028	2	8
6. Georgia.....	58,000	521,572	2	8
7. Alabama.....	50,722	426,514	2	7
8. Maryland.....	11,000	417,943	2	6
9. Mississippi.....	47,151	295,718	2	5
10. Louisiana.....	41,346	255,491	2	4
11. South Carolina.....	28,000	274,563	2	6
12. Arkansas.....	52,193	182,189	2	2
13. Texas.....	325,520	154,034	2	2
14. Delaware.....	2,120	71,169	2	1
15. Florida.....	59,288	47,203	2	1
<b>Fifteen States.....</b>	<b>928,894</b>	<b>6,184,477</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>90</b>

### Population.

Fifteen free States contain .....	13,147,035
Fifteen slave States " .....	6,184,477

The fifteen free States have more than double the free white population that the fifteen slave States have.

### Territory.

Fifteen slave States contain.....	928,894 square miles.
Fifteen free States " .....	454,344 " "

Difference.....	474,550 " "
-----------------	-------------

The fifteen slave States contain more than double the territory of the fifteen free States.

In other words, *the slave States now have about five times the extent of territory, according to population, that the free States have*; including slaves and all, they have about three times the territory of the free States, according to population! Yet they would still encroach upon free territory. They still demand more for slavery.

Nine slave States have been added, containing.....	722,922 square miles
--	----------------------

Six free States have been added, containing.....	290,263 " "
--	-------------

Difference.....	432,659 " "
-----------------	-------------

Maine and Vermont were formed by dividing old States, and not from added territory. While the free States have more than double the population, the slave States have gained more than double the territory by the admission of new States. That is, the addition made (by the admission of new States) to the limits of slavery is about *five times* in extent when compared with the addition made to the free States in proportion to numbers.

The five purchased slave States of Florida, Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Missouri, contain 543,369 square miles.

The whole fifteen free States contain 454,344 square miles.

The territory added to the slave States by purchase is larger than all the fifteen free States by 89,025 square miles.

This excess is a larger territory than is contained in seven of the free States. *And this was all purchased to extend slavery*; while the free States admitted have been formed out of territory belonging to the United States when the Government was established, and to which the ordinance of Jefferson and of freedom, prohibiting slavery, was applied by the fathers of the Republic.

When so much has been yielded to slavery, will Southern Representatives object to admitting *one* free State out of all the purchased territory?

### IV.

#### REPRESENTATION.

The fifteen free States have 13,000,000 of free white inhabitants, the fifteen slave States

6,000,000; yet each have thirty Senators. True, the small States are entitled to two Senators each, as well as the larger ones; but this number of slave States, extended over a large territory with a small population, makes the disproportioned representation of the two sections in the Senate too palpably unjust. *In Senators the slave States have, by this system, kept up a representation in the proportion of two to one as against the free States.*

In the House, the slave States have ninety members, representing 6,000,000 of population; the free States, one hundred and forty-two members, representing 13,000,000. Upon the same ratio with the slave States, the free States should have *one hundred and ninety-five members—a loss to them of fifty-three*—in the popular branch of the Government; that in which the popular voice is to be heard and the popular will expressed.

South Carolina has *six* Representatives, with a free white population of 274,563.

New Hampshire has *three* Representatives, with a free white population of 317,456.

Vermont has *three* Representatives, with a free white population of 313,402.

Vermont and New Hampshire, with a population of 630,858, have *six* Representatives.

South Carolina has *six* also, with only 274,563; less, by 356,295—not one-half as much.

At the ratio of South Carolina representation, these free States should have *fourteen* Representatives instead of *six*. Is there not a wide difference in the *political* rights of these States? My district has a population of over 100,000; the ratio of South Carolina is about 45,000; that would more than double the representation of every free State.

Three Congressional districts in New York contain a larger free white population than the State of South Carolina. Yet this is the State that is going to *force* slavery into Kansas,—the one that has so often complained of the hardships of remaining one of the United States, and *threatened disunion!*

With over 110,000 more slaves than white inhabitants, to be held in subjection, what a formidable force South Carolina could command to destroy the Union! Only think, what a regiment she could muster! and think, too, what deep cause she has for revolution! *More than twice the representation according to numbers! and, therefore, more than twice the political power, in proportion, allowed to any free State in the Union!* And all the “moral power” of the “national institution” besides! This may be the reason why South Carolina had no less than three prominent candidates for Speaker in the present House! There was none from New Hampshire or Vermont! *And this unequal representation South Carolina would retain if twenty free States were admitted.* Why, then, should she object? Florida has

47,203 white inhabitants; Delaware 71,169: both together have about the same population as the St. Lawrence and Herkimer Congressional district in New York, formerly represented by Preston King; yet these two slave States have *six* electoral votes; this district has but one. South Carolina has a less white population than a single Congressional district in Iowa! yet it has *eight* electoral votes—the Iowa district only *one!*

*Politically*, slavery is the greatest of all institutions,—a foe to capital, energy, enterprise, and improvement. The very soil loses half its value where slavery desecrates it. Yet slavery is the great *political* institution of this country. *Politicians and office-seekers*—from presidential aspirants, who promulgate their devotion from high places, down to the lowest menial in or about the public offices—are swift to do it reverence, eager rivals to be foremost in aiding its *further extension and more permanent ascendancy*. They vie with each other as to who shall be its most rampant and rabid advocate, and stoop the lowest to propitiate its favor. And this will continue so long as *devotion to slavery is the only passport to office*. On this single ground stood all the rival candidates for the nomination at Cincinnati. Upon this each relied for success. To them, their subserviency to slavery was more important than ability, honesty, or integrity. An avowed determination to *extend slavery* was the all-important qualification. All stood on this platform, but most pre-eminently the nominee of the miscalled Democracy, now having but one policy and one principle,—*the extension of human bondage.*

## V.

### REPRESENTATION UPON SLAVE PROPERTY.

Unwisely the framers of the Constitution allowed a representation upon property in one instance,—a thing plainly wrong in principle in a republican and representative government; and, unfortunately, allowed it upon that kind of property upon which, of all others, no representation should have been given. *It was upon slaves.* The basis of representation, as adopted, allowed *three-fifths* of all slaves to be counted; and gave this unequal—and, therefore, unfair and unjust—representation in favor of the owners of that species of property over all others. True, this was done by Northern as well as Southern votes. But it should be borne in mind that slavery then existed in every State in the Union; that we had become deeply involved in debt by the war of the Revolution. *And direct taxes were apportioned in the same manner.* If some States had more slaves than others, and, therefore, this provision might be, in some small degree, unequal, it was

thought the burden imposed with it, as to the payment of taxes, would be a fair equivalent for the advantage it might confer. And, besides, the slave-trade was prohibited after 1808, and slavery was expected soon to be an institution numbered with the things of the past. At that time this representation was really of little moment, and did not probably give to any State a single member on slave property alone.

The Government was inaugurated with a policy wholly *opposed to the extension of slavery*, and looking confidently to its speedy extinction. The ordinance prohibiting slavery was applied to all our Territories by almost unanimous consent. Slavery was thus confined to the States where it existed, and its stream cut off at the fountain-head, by the abolition of the slave-trade.

But, soon after our Government went into operation, it was discovered that slave representation had an unexpected and magic effect. It brought into solid column, united and bound together, all who came from States in which slavery existed, to such an extent as to render it of important consequence as a *property interest or a political element*.

Thus united, they became more and more controlling. They swayed the policy and decided the measures of the Government. They used the power obtained to *extend the institution*, and thus increase their sectional strength and political influence. Hence the Southern policy of *EXPANSION and DISPERSION*, of which this country furnishes the most remarkable example to be found in the history of the world. This led to the purchase of *Louisiana* as early as 1803, and has since been followed by the purchase of *Florida*, the acquisition of *New Mexico*, and the annexation of *Texas*. That slave republic (almost as large as all the free States) was annexed to extend the "area of freedom!"

This policy of the extension of slavery, and its dispersion as far and wide as possible, to strengthen and secure the *political ascendancy of slave-owners*, has led to all the outrages in relation to the *free Territory of Kansas*, from the act of Congress to the acts of the border ruffians in Kansas, the butchery of its people, and the destruction of Lawrence, and to the outrages of slave-owners here at the Capitol,—all having a common object:—*to force the extension of slavery, for political purposes, into free territory*. To this policy we owe all the evils of the present alarming state of affairs throughout the land. From it every slavery agitation has arisen. These have always occurred when this policy has been checked or opposed by the free States. And this policy has been steadily pursued under every possible and contradictory pretence, and owes its origin, and thus far its success, to the fact that slavery is made a political element by al-

lowing a representation upon slave property, and the free States have never before been unitedly opposed to it.

## VI.

### EFFECT OF THE EXTENSION OF SLAVERY.

It has placed the power of the Government in the hands of slave-holders. They hold it now, and have almost entirely for the last sixty years. Mr. Clay admitted, in 1850, that the policy and measures of the Government had been controlled for the last fifty years by "the preponderating influence of Southern councils," and he enumerated the leading measures enacted and defeated by "Southern councils,"—sometimes being *for* and then *against* the same measure, and always *successful*. Indeed, almost from the formation of the Government, the slave-holding States have shaped its policy and controlled its action. No measure of any *political importance*, prejudicial to the aims and interests of slavery, has ever been passed. For the last fifty years, the free States, so far as the General Government is concerned, might almost as well have been governed without any voice in the elections, or any representation in Congress. The measures adopted have been dictated by slave-holders, and their real policy has been—and it is now openly avowed—the *extension of slavery*. That has now become the only real politics of this country. *There is not an aristocracy in any Government of Europe that holds the power in it that the slave-holders have held, and now hold, in this free democratic representative Republic*. This is not a matter of theory; it is the undisputed truth of history, demonstrated by an experience of sixty years. It is not the result of accident, but of a settled system, the natural effect of an adequate cause. With thirty Senators and ninety Representatives, *personally and politically bound to the support of slavery*, and, without any property representation or union of *interests* at the North, this result was inevitable.

The slave States, with less than *half* the population of the free States, have extended slavery more than *twice* as far as the free States have "enlarged the area of freedom;" that is, in the proportion of *five to one*. *Nine* new slave States have been added. To extend the free States in the same proportion they should have added *eighteen* free States. They have only added *six*, and these much smaller in extent. The slave States have added *eighteen* Senators. The free States should, in proportion, have added *thirty-six*. They have only added *twelve*, (and four more gained by dividing old States.) The slave States have added *forty-eight* members in this House: the free States in proportion should have *ninety-six*. They have only added *forty-nine*, (and nine more by the division of old States.) *Were Kansas, Nebraska, Utah, New Mexico,*

Minnesota, Oregon, and Washington, all admitted as free States, the free States would not then be equal in extent of territory or number of Representatives with the slave States, in proportion to population. The admission of free States would only lessen—not remove—the inequality between the free and slave States, leaving still this unequal representation in favor of the slave States, to the full extent of all their slave property. Can they ask for more than that?

## VII.

### THE SLAVE POWER.

It is supposed by many that this privileged class—this aristocracy, in fact, established upon human bondage—embraces the great mass of the people of the Southern States. This is not so. *It is the slave-owners alone*; and these form only a small portion of the people of the slave States. The following statement, taken from the census of 1850, will show the number of slave-owners in the slave States:—

States.	Slaveholders in each.
Alabama.....	29,295
Arkansas.....	5,999
Delaware.....	809
Florida.....	3,529
Georgia.....	38,456
Kentucky.....	35,385
Louisiana.....	20,670
Maryland.....	16,040
Mississippi.....	23,116
Missouri.....	19,185
North Carolina.....	28,203
South Carolina.....	25,596
Tennessee.....	33,864
Texas.....	7,747
Virginia.....	55,063
Total.....	346,048

Thus it will be seen that the number of slave-owners, including *men, women, and children*, is only about three hundred and forty-six thousand; and the free white population over six millions in the slave States. Or only about one in twenty of the white population in the slave States are slave-owners. Yet this small number, by a union of interest, and by the political importance given to slavery, rule these States absolutely and despotically; the great majority of the people—a majority of nearly *twenty to one*—are never heard of, and have no more power in those States, *politically*, than the slaves its *aristocratic rulers* own! This is truly astonishing; but the condition of the General Government is more so. The free population of the Union is about twenty millions. The slave-owners now number some three hundred and forty-six thousand. For the last fifty years their numbers would average from one hundred and fifty to two hundred thousand. Yet the General Government is in their hands, and has been for the past fifty years, when the majority against them in the

Union is as *sixty to one*; still they hold the power, and the Government is directed and controlled by them, and has been almost ever since it has been in operation. And, during all that time, more than *one-half* of all the important offices of the Government—and I believe nearly *two-thirds* of those offices—have been filled by *slaveholders*, to the exclusion of the great mass of the people of the United States!

Slaveholders have political advantages denied to all other men! A man who owns two thousand slaves has the same political power, on his slave property, as twelve hundred inhabitants of the free States. His power is larger than that of all the voters in a town of ordinary size,—almost equal to that of all the electors in some counties in the free State! He has, besides, *individually*, the same political power as the richest man in a free State. *This additional right—twelve hundred strong—is solely in consideration of his owning two thousand slaves as property!* Yet men in the free States holding property of a value equal to his, or far exceeding it, have no political advantage from it, let their property be what it may. There is no property has any political power but slave property, and that (estimated at \$3,000,000,000) scattered over more than two-thirds of the territory of the Union—controlling half the States, combined in a single interest, and made a political element—controls this Government. Slavery is *political*; and politicians are its arrogant champions. *There can be no end of slavery aggression and slavery agitation until you disconnect slavery and politics; until it is settled—and definitely settled—that slavery cannot be extended for political purposes.* Until that is done, there can be no peace and no end of agitation.

## VIII.

### THE ADMINISTRATION AND SLAVERY.

The political power of slavery has been strikingly illustrated by the present Administration. The President came into office by the largest popular vote ever given, with a strong majority in both branches of Congress, all deeply pledged against further "*slavery agitation*," in any form, in or out of Congress. This was the corner-stone of their party creed. Yet, almost as soon as they had taken their oaths of office, the slave power demanded the *free Territory of Kansas*, and reopened and renewed the slavery agitation in Congress and out of it, to accomplish its object, by repealing the prohibition against slavery north of the Missouri Compromise line. Slavery demanded this wrong to be done; and to do it the whole power of the President and his party was put into requisition. The faith of the nation that had pledged it to freedom in 1820, the pledges of the party made in 1852, the oft-repeated pledges

of the President, and almost every member of his party in Congress, against agitation, were all disregarded!—*all violated!* It became the great measure of the Administration. Slavery required it; and what to slavery was national faith, or party pledges, or individual integrity? All other considerations must yield. The supremacy of slavery—its *political supremacy*—must be secured! and the deed was done!—*Kansas was opened to slavery!*

Slavery was strong enough to compels a Northern President to violate his repeated pledges, and labour to introduce slavery into free territory,—a thing that Henry Clay, although a Southern man, spurned the mere imputation of in words of burning eloquence.

"I never can—I never will—vote, and no earthly power will ever make me to vote, to spread slavery over territory where it does not exist."—(Henry Clay, in 1850, in the U. S. Senate.)

How have the pledges of the Democratic party against agitation been redeemed? By passing a law in Congress to spread slavery over territory where it did not exist, (upon the same principle it can be forced into a free State,) where the question of slavery was at rest, and where it was "*prohibited forever.*" The most atrocious measure ever attempted for the extension of slavery; a measure that has caused a greater agitation, and made a deeper impression on the public mind against slavery, than all its previous aggressions!

The President also pledged himself to protect and *sacredly to maintain* the individual rights of every citizen, "at home and abroad, upon every sea and on every soil."

In the best days of Rome, the claim to be a Roman citizen was a protection in far-off and foreign lands. And it is the proudest boast of England, that her Government protects every citizen under it with jealous care. A wrong done to any one of her people is regarded as a national wrong, and as such redressed.

The Secretary of State made a strong case, on paper, for interfering with a foreign Government in the case of Martin Koszta, who had merely declared his intention to become an American citizen. All that was well. It gratified national pride. But how has the President maintained the rights of the people of Kansas,—American citizens,—here at home, —on our own soil,—residing in a Territory of the United States,—governed by its laws, and directly under the care of the President,—whose officers are appointed and removed by him, and accountable to him? Have they been protected in their property or in their persons? Many months ago, *Colman*, a pro-slavery man, shot *Dow* in the highway,—a woman; and unpunished murder. But the officials of the President have taken no notice of it to this day. After this, *Barbour*, a settler in Kansas, was shot, when riding home, by *Clark*, a pro-slavery man, then and now holding the office of

Indian agent under the President. No proceedings were ever taken against him. The *judges*, and *marshals*, and *attorney*, appointed by the President, were all silent and approving. How were their rights protected? How were the rights of the generous-hearted *Brown* protected? He was assaulted by a mob and most inhumanly mangled and mutilated, and left to die, and only carried, bleeding, to his home in time for his wife and his children to behold him expire! *That wife is now insane!*

These are some of the triumphs of border-ruffianism in Kansas,—fearful evidences, among the living and the dead, of the law and order party in Kansas,—*of the protection of the President*,—of that party the President sustains by a standing army, the last resort of every despotism on earth. These and kindred deeds are openly perpetrated, and almost openly defended, clearly connived at and encouraged! *For in no instance has any man been prosecuted for these crimes, or even censured by the President. In no instance has even the leader of a mob been arrested; no murderer is brought to justice; no crime is prevented or punished.* This is the protection afforded to our fellow-citizens in Kansas. To protect them no arm is raised; no orders given: But to oppress them, to drag them into submission to slavery, the troops of the United States are sent forth by order of the President, and treacherously used to protect murderers and butcher peaceable citizens. What now is the condition of Kansas under the President's protection? Let the blood of the murdered victims of tyranny and oppression bear witness! No free-State man is protected in his rights; no property is safe; no man's life secure.

In none of the President's messages, regular or irregular, annual or special, (put forth to forestall public opinion and aid his renomination,) has any allusion been made to the monstrous outrages and cruel murders committed in Kansas, although matters of public notoriety. But he covertly reproaches the free States for allowing emigration to Kansas, and palliates all the cruelties and crimes the advocates of slavery extension have perpetrated; and most justly is he responsible for all the fearful consequences. But if a slave escapes into Massachusetts,—if, driven to desperation, any settler from a free State is even charged with a violation of the infamous laws of the Territory,—a military force is put into requisition, and protection is offered or punishment inflicted. Then the laws are executed with a vengeance. Even the meeting of a convention to adopt a free constitution, and ask admission as a State, is held by the pro-slavery judges, appointed for Kansas by the President, to be a criminal offence. And criminal prosecutions before these judges, under official instructions as it is said, are vigorously prosecuted. But as to robbery and murder committed to aid in



establishing slavery in Kansas, against these there is no law, and for these crimes there is no punishment!

The blood of the murdered freemen that has stained the soil of Kansas will rise up to heaven bearing its witness against slavery. It has already spoken to the heart of every freeman in the land, and rendered the establishment of slavery in Kansas impossible. "They never fail who die in a great cause." And, by the unalterable law of eternal justice, crimes like these are never permitted to pass unpunished.

## IX.

### POLITICAL POWER OF SLAVERY.

Every department of the Government—except, thank God! the House of Representatives—is in the hands of the slave power. Some three hundred and forty-six thousand slave-owners control and rule twenty millions of people. That is the power that rules, and has for sixty years ruled, the American Republic.

**1. As to the President.**—Did he not bow down on his knees before it in the most humiliating position? To please this power,—that makes and unmakes Presidents,—did he not violate the pledges he made to the American people? Was he not alike false to truth and to freedom? Has he not permitted every crime and cruelty to pass unpunished and unquestioned in Kansas? Nay, has he not aided and abetted their perpetration? And, as the last crowning act of all this submission to slavery, has he not been the means of the destruction of Lawrence? And, when a universal butchery was expected, did he not look coldly on, and refuse to raise his hand to save them? His name will be remembered in history, hereafter, only because attached to it there will be a wide inheritance of infamy. And, for all this, what was his reward? To be flung aside as a useless thing, because he had served slavery with such a desperate, calculating zeal, as to meet the condemnation of all honest men. He could serve the slave-owners no more. The American people would never re-elect so servile a tool of the barbarian element of the Government. He was thrown aside for another, promising equal servility, and who had not as yet become equally odious, but who promised, most faithfully, to follow in his footsteps,—perhaps to go beyond them!

**2. As to the Senate.**—There the rule of slavery has long been absolute. It only registers the edicts of slave-owners! It only represents that interest and that institution! The free States, with 13,000,000 people, have thirty Senators; many of them, from *personal* or *political* motives, the firm allies of slavery. Nearly every Northern pro-slavery Senator is a presidential aspirant! The slave States, with

6,000,000, have also thirty Senators, unitedly representing one single pecuniary and political interest, sleepless and untiring in its support. Look at this!

*Votes of eleven slave-holding States at the election of 1852, when Mr. Pierce was chosen, as contrasted with the vote of New York:—*

1. Arkansas.....	19,577	7. Texas.....	18,547
2. Delaware.....	12,673	8. Alabama.....	41,919
3. Florida.....	7,193	9. Louisiana.....	36,902
4. Georgia.....	51,365	10. Mississippi.....	44,424
5. Maryland.....	75,153	11. Virginia.....	129,545
6. North Carolina.....	78,861		
Aggregate vote of eleven States.....	515,159		
Vote of New York.....	522,234		

Being 7135 votes more than all the others.

These *eleven* States, (Virginia included,) that gave in 1852 a less vote than New York for President, have *twenty-two* Senators; New York has only *two*!

The whole object of the Kansas-Nebraska act, and all the wrongs committed under it, *was to increase this unequal preponderance of the slave power in the Senate, and to add also to its controlling influence in the House.*

The same eleven slave States have 57 Representatives.  
New York has..... 33

Difference in favor of slavery..... 24

These eleven slave States have **79** electoral votes; New York has **35!!!**—more than *two* to one in favor of slavery!!

Fair and equal representation lies at the very foundation of a Republican Government; and every departure from it is a step towards despotism. Here it creates a real aristocracy—a privileged class—that rules over a free people.

*The Senate is part of the appointing power.*—This ordeal no man can pass, no matter how pure, honest, faithful, and competent, if he is opposed to the extension of slavery. If he is unsound upon the *nationality* of slavery,—nay, if only suspected of having a *sectional* preference for *freedom*,—his fate is sealed.

The President nominates, and the Senate appoints, the judges of the Supreme, Circuit, and District Courts; the whole Federal Judiciary; and almost all the other officers of the General Government, except members of Congress. This immense patronage and power of appointment by the President and the Senate is a tower of strength to slavery, and an unflinching political guillotine to all who oppose it.

*The President and Senate, also, have the treaty-making power;* and under a treaty it is claimed that *Cuba*, or any other slave territory, can be purchased, at any price, and with a stipulation to make of it any number of slave States. And the House, it is said, without any voice, is bound by the treaty,—must pay the price, and perform the stipulations! And if any one

doubts this monstrous proposition, *its constitutionality is to be decided by the judges the Senate and President appoint!* General Gadsden has long been on a fishing excursion to purchase more territory for slavery!

**3. As to the Judiciary.**—The appointment of the judges is removed furthest from the people, and is placed where the power of slavery is always strongest; and, consequently, the *slave-owners*, only numbering *one in sixty*, have always had a *majority* of the judges, and a *majority* on the bench of the Supreme Court; and the others taken from the free States must be “national:” that is, in every contest, opposed to freedom and in favor of slavery.

*The power that creates is greater than the thing created.*—And many alarming encroachments have lately been attempted upon the rights of freedom by the Federal Judges: one is the recent audacious doctrine, that slaves can be held in the *free* States as well as in the slave States—thus striking down the independence and sovereignty of the free States, and judicially establishing slavery therein. Slavery depends upon the laws of the States. Where it is allowed, slaves can be held; where it is not, they cannot. Some States have passed laws giving slave-holders a right of passing through the State with their slaves. Where this right exists, it is by virtue of the State law, and is solely regulated by the State. *And there is no power under the Constitution, in any department or in all the departments of Government, that can compel a State to hold slaves as property.* If this is attempted it is an invasion of State rights, and should be resisted. Such an attempt by the Supreme Court is a *judicial usurpation*, and not binding on the States.

This question has been recently before the Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, and, as I am informed, virtually decided, although the case was dismissed. And mark that decision! It is that slaves can be held as property in a free State! It is said, too, that this decision is made by the proslavery judges from slave States! And that every judge who heard the case from a free State held a contrary opinion, in conformity with the well-settled law in this country and in England, and in accordance with every principle of reason and common sense. How absurd it is to say that the law of one State must be controlled within its own limits, where it is *supreme*, by the *conflicting* law of any other State! Georgia allows slavery; New York prohibits it. The Supreme Court says that the laws of Georgia are of higher authority within the State of New York than her own laws! or, in other words, the Supreme Court sets up slavery as above the constitutions and laws of the free States! That is *judicial legislation by the Federal judges in*

*favor of slavery.* It cannot—and never will—be submitted to by any free State. If it is, the boast the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Toombs] is said to have tauntingly made, that he would yet “call the roll of his slaves on Bunker Hill,” may now be fulfilled. If this is submitted to, there needs no more legislation in Congress to *extend* slavery. It is already made the supreme law of the land. If it cannot be prohibited in the free States they are no longer free. *This is the court to decide upon the constitutionality of slavery and of all laws and treaties to extend it.* This power might as well be given to so many overseers selected from slave plantations as to judges thus appointed and controlled, *if this decision has been made, and is a specimen of their independence and integrity.*

Citizens of slave States carry the laws of those States with them into free States! That is the position. It involves a long list of absurdities:—1. It destroys the independence and equality of the several States. 2. It gives to non-residents of a State rights denied to its own citizens. 3. In a case of *conflicting* State laws—each supreme in the State where it exists—it gives one class of States jurisdiction within the limits of the other, and effectually destroys the independence and sovereignty of the latter, by nullifying their laws and imposing upon them laws in defiance of, and in direct hostility with, theirs. If every citizen from a slave State carries the law of slavery into free States, why does not every citizen from a free State carry the law of freedom into a slave State? If the laws of South Carolina can be set up in New York as superior to the laws of New York it is no longer a free State: it is a mere province under South Carolina! And what is law in New York will depend on the place from which the non-resident came, and what may happen to be law where he last resided! And there may be fifteen different laws in full force in New York, each nullifying its own laws, and in direct conflict and hostility with them!

The law of each State must be supreme within its limits, or all freedom and self-government is destroyed.

The recent outrage committed upon the rights of a citizen of Pennsylvania by a United States District Judge has awakened the public indignation, and excited attention to the course of the Federal judges appointed by the slave power, whose acts are usually unobserved,—one decision furnishing a precedent for another. Judge Kane (a name ominous of evil) issued a *habeas corpus*, not to restore to freedom some person illegally restrained of liberty, but to take and return *three* persons to slavery who had, being in a *free* State, asserted their right to freedom, and left their master. This, Judge Kane had no right whatever to do, least of all to attempt under a writ

of *habeas corpus*. But Williamson, to whom this unlawful writ was directed, returned to it, that the slaves claimed were not in his custody, and he could not bring them before the judge. And that return was proved to be indisputably true. But Mr. Williamson had advised these slaves that they were free,—*having been voluntarily brought by their master into a free State*. For this insult to their master—who was both a *slave-holder* and an *office-holder*—he must be punished. He had violated no law, civil or criminal, State or National, in giving this opinion. He had only advised these slaves what were their legal rights. If this was a crime, the law was open to Mr. Wheeler: he had only “to prove and punish,” for all that Williamson did was openly done, and never denied.

But, then, Williamson must be prosecuted and tried, according to the Constitution and laws of the United States and of Pennsylvania. And what would be the accusation? Under what law could the indictment be framed? And what jury could be found to convict him? No; that would be unavailing. Judge Kane, therefore, became the poor, pitiful instrument of Mr. Wheeler to regain his slaves by an unauthorized proceeding, if he could; and, failing in that, to punish Williamson under the *false pretence* of a contempt against Judge Kane; on which accusation he was deprived of his liberty, without crime or trial, from July to November. A power given to courts for their necessary protection, without any fixed limits left to their discretion, was thus wantonly abused to deprive a citizen of his rights and of his liberty. For this high-handed and arbitrary exercise of power Judge Kane should be impeached and degraded from the place he is unworthy to hold. And had no other member of this House moved, I would have moved his impeachment before this day, but for the fact that his judges would be the Senate who appointed him,—the Senate, which represents only the slave power in this Government; and his subserviency to slavery would, with them, be a matter of praise, not of censure. It would probably elevate him to a higher position.

There is but one tribunal which can redress these wrongs,—the people, the stern condemnation of the popular voice, that rules and regulates at last every department of Government.

Behold the power of slavery in our Government:—

1. *It has the President.*
2. *It has the Senate.*
3. *It has the Judiciary.*

In this House only can freedom make a stand! This is truly the battle-ground; and woe to the Representative from a *free State* hereafter, who proves recreant to the cause of *freedom and equal rights!*

## X.

### THE FALSEHOOD OF THE ASSERTION THAT “THE PEOPLE OF KANSAS ARE ‘PER- FECTLY FREE.’”

1. Slavery admitted into this free Territory by act of Congress!

2. The Governor appointed by the President; and, if not heart and soul for slavery, he is removed, and another appointed who is!

3. The Judges all appointed by the President; and all the other officials, including secretary, attorney, and marshal, and a military force stationed there under his command!

4. A Legislature elected by armed invaders from Missouri, who have established slavery under severe penalties, prohibited “freedom of speech” and of “the press,” and prescribed “cruel and unusual punishments” to prevent the exercise of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States!

5. A proclamation by the President requiring the people of Kansas to submit to these laws; and that any hesitation or refusal would be promptly put down by military force! denouncing beforehand, as “treasonable insurrection,” the right of the people “peaceably to assemble” and to “ask for a redress of grievances” by their admission as a State; that is, asking the right of “self-government”!

6. Border ruffianism and border-ruffian laws enforced by the military, and the perfect freedom of the people of Kansas being death or submission!

How “perfectly free” the people of Kansas are left! How secure “in their persons, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures,” under the Constitution! The captain of the steamboat who put on shore the rifles of the settlers on their way to Kansas, taken for self-defence, and who thus unlawfully seized and deprived them of their property, has since been in this city, but he has not been called to any account by the authorities here or in Kansas. He received no censure or rebuke: he probably came here to claim a high reward for this valuable service.

The President’s judges in Kansas are engaged in a more congenial employment. I read from the Baltimore Sun:—

#### “Kansas Affairs.”

“WASHINGTON, April 8.—Associate-Justice Burrill, of Kansas, is said to be in Washington for consultation with the executive authorities relative to the course judicially to pursue towards the officers of the *free-State* organization.”

The judges of Kansas, it seems, are to be regulated, not by *law*, but by *executive* instruction, as to what shall be held innocent or criminal in Kansas; as to what party or persons shall be hunted down and dragooned into submission by criminal prosecutions; as to the crime for which they shall be indicted and convicted, and the punishment to which they shall be subjected,—like the Star-Chamber prose-

cutions in England, when the infamous Jeffreys was judge! Here is a large power not found in the Constitution:—*criminal prosecution for political opinions. And a larger indictment:—all opposed to slavery are to be dealt with as traitors!—all who are for a free-State organization!* The people who assembled peaceably in convention to adopt a constitution and ask admission as a State, under the General Government, as they had a right to do by the Constitution, as the people of every other Territory have done, are treated as levying war against the United States, and are to be convicted of treason, *by the judiciary of Kansas*, (in that they have attempted to make Kansas a free State,)—*high treason—against slavery and President Pierce!* Judge Kane should be promoted to this branch of the “national service!” Let him be the Jeffreys of America; or placed, at least, beside Lecompt! Judge Lecompt, it would seem, has received instructions and is at the work. Indictments have been found against *freemen* concerned in the high crime of asking for admission as a free State! Governor Robinson, and other leading men from the free States, are now imprisoned on such charges as these! They were left “perfectly free” to choose freedom or slavery! Their crime was in choosing freedom! That is the only unpardonable political sin with this *anti-agitation Administration* and its *pure judiciary* in Kansas! The Constitution provides that treason “shall consist *only in levying war against the United States*,” or adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort; and that it must be proved by *two witnesses to the same overt act*. Judge Lecompt has directed indictments charging treason for peaceably asking for admission as a State and *protection* under the Constitution! and no proof required! A petition for a free State is rebellion against the Government! and submission under the Constitution is *levying war!*

## XI.

### SETTLEMENT OF SLAVERY AGITATION.

#### CONSTITUTION.

“Representation and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States that may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons.”—*Constitution, article 1, section 2.*

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENT.

“Representation and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which are, or hereafter may be, included within this Union, according to their respective number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed.”

Such an amendment would repeal both *taxation and representation upon slaves*, one being the equivalent for the other. It would relieve the slave States from the *taxation*, and the free States from the *representation*; and it would

restore equality of representation and of political rights to all the States. The slave property—estimated at \$2,000,000,000—would still retain its just influence in the Government as a great property interest, like every other species of property; but it would have no separate, distinct, political importance given to its owners over all other kinds of property, as an element of political power. This would disconnect slavery and politics.

*First.* Representation upon property is wrong in principle, and proves in practice to be dangerous to the peace and welfare of the country; for to this cause, under all kinds of pretexts, every agitation on the slavery question can be traced. It was this that caused it in 1820, when the Missouri Compromise was adopted, which was regarded by the South (as Mr. Pinckney then said) as a “great triumph,” *politically*, one which would “give the South, in a short time, an addition of *six*, and perhaps *eight*, members of the Senate of the United States!” In fact, by that, and the other measures in consequence, the South have more than realized the prediction,—gaining *ten* Senators and *sixteen* members.

*Second.* It would end at once and forever the agitation of the question of slavery in Congress, and remove the cause of constant irritation and the most dangerous and disturbing element under our Constitution, the only one that endangers the perpetuity of the Union.

*Third.* When the Constitution was adopted, all the States had slaves: now, one-half of them have no such property; so that this representation, in which all were then interested, now benefits only a *section*, or one-half of the States; and the great increase of slaves in those States has rendered the inequality among the States so great as to require correction. *Nearly one-third* of all the Representatives from the slave States hold their seats by virtue of representation upon slave property. The change since the Constitution requires a change in that.

*Fourth.* Direct taxes are not resorted to to defray the expenses of Government, or to pay the national debts, and never have been. *The money for Government is collected under a revenue system, mostly in the free States, nearly one-fourth of it in the city of New York.* The representation on slave property has, therefore, been had by one section without any equivalent received by the other, as was intended by the Constitution.

*Fifth.* The effect of this provision—which has placed this Government in the hands of a *privileged class, an aristocracy in fact, banded together by one single interest*—was not then understood. Now it requires change, and that a fair system of *equal representation* should be adopted.

Here is a remedy for all the political evils with which slavery has so long distracted the

country,—an effectual and final remedy,—a peaceful, constitutional remedy,—one which requires the vote of two-thirds of both Houses, and cannot, therefore, be forced upon one section by the other,—one which can never be adopted except from a conviction of its propriety. Why not adopt it? Is it not a matter of justice and equality? Why seek to retain an unequal share of the power of the Government in the hands of any section or class? For my part, I declare myself willing to remove any just cause of complaint the slave States have in the Constitution or out of it. *Are they equally willing to do so?—to stand upon a just and true equality with the free States?* If not, let them never blame us for refusing to extend and increase this unjust and unequal representation by the admission of other slave States. Our only defence against being without any voice in the Government, in that case, is to refuse their admission. In time, the increase of our numbers, and the admission of new States, will gradually—not remove, but—lessen this unequal power given to the South, over us, by representation upon property. To that gradual change we must, then, look solely for relief. But we must forget all parties in the free States, and unite to maintain the existence of a free Government, and to defend the equal rights of the free States. Past experience must teach the free States to trust no man in Congress, hereafter, in the Senate or in the House, who is not true to freedom, and devoted, heart and soul, *to the maintenance of the equal rights of the free States.*

## XII.

### DISUNION.

But, the slave States say, if we do not yield they will secede from the Union! If, because we refuse to put absolute power in their hands, (they almost have it now,) they will separate from us, so be it. By that act they would lose the whole of that unequal power of which we complain. They would come down to an equality then. They would lose the right to reclaim fugitive slaves. They would be relieved from the unpleasant power of governing thirteen millions of people and from all the cares of office. What a day of lamentation it would be in the Old Dominion, when all their clerks should leave their places and cease to receive their salaries! They would lose all the advantages of the Union, while they would labor under every disadvantage they do now, and many others of a much more formidable character. The threat of disunion is worn out! It has been useful often. It is idle now. The free States have real causes for complaint, the slave States none. It were better not to invite attention to the advantages and disadvantages of disunion. The North, now true and loyal, may come to favor it. They may come to think they are capable of self-government, and wish to try the experi-

ment and set up on their own account; and that would be the greatest of all calamities to slavery,—one from which it could never recover.

## XIII.

### ADMISSION OF KANSAS.

But we shall neither have an amendment of the Constitution nor a dissolution of the Union!

What, then, shall be the fate of Kansas? I ask Southern men if they will refuse to admit one free State out of all the purchased territory, and from which five slave States have already been admitted? Will you refuse to allow the pledge your section made in 1820 to be redeemed? Will you violate the pledge you made in the last Congress, to leave the people of Kansas "perfectly free" to settle this question? They ask for admission as a free State! Will you refuse to restore peace to the country, as it was before you made this attempt to take free territory for slavery? *You have taken five times as much already as the free States have in proportion; would you, indeed, if you could, make the inequality still greater?* Will you refuse to give security and protection to the people of Kansas, and leave them longer exposed to murder, robbery, and violence? Will you refuse to them the right of self-government? And for what? In the hope, by prolonging this struggle, to make Kansas a slave State? Believe me, that never can be done! The sooner Kansas is admitted the better! Recall the error you have made. That is the only wise and true policy.

I demand the admission of Kansas, because it was set off to freedom in the division made by the South in 1820, and for it the South has received more than an ample equivalent.

I demand it, because it was then pledged to freedom: that pledge should be redeemed!

I demand it, because the greatest and by far the most valuable portions of these Territories have been surrendered to slavery. This only was to be free, and this we claim for freedom; and if this is refused the free States get nothing.

I demand it, because by the legislation of last Congress the people of Kansas were to be left free to choose, and they have decided for freedom.

I demand it, because the Senators and Representatives advocating that act disclaimed wishing or expecting to make a slave State of Kansas; they only desired to assert a principle and repeal a sectional line!

I demand it as matter of equality and justice, after such immense additions have been made to the slave States, that corresponding additions shall be made to the free States.

I demand it to preserve in any degree the equality of the States and the political rights of the free States.

I demand it to repair the wrongs done by the last Congress and to quiet the agitation it has caused.

I demand it as the right of the people of Kansas to be admitted as a State under the Constitution.

I demand it to place them under the protection of a government of law, to relieve them from the despotism of a mob or of a military force, and to give them security in their property and in their persons.

Admit Kansas, and all will be well. Refuse it, and who knows when, or where, or how, this "war," as it is called, between the two sections, will end? It is a war, at least, in which we have right, justice, honor, honesty, truth, and freedom, on our side; a war in which we have every thing to gain and nothing to lose; and one in which slavery has every thing to lose, and can gain nothing. If it

continues it is because Southern men desire it. *Will they have it so?* If they will, let them remember Kansas can never be admitted as a slave State. All the blood that has been or may be shed,—all the outrages of slavery,—all the appeals to violence and brute force,—only deepen the feeling and add to the certainty that it can only be admitted as a free State. Do it, then, at once, and restore peace and concord again. Who can foresee to what this struggle, if continued, may lead? We cannot, dare not, yield. Will Southern men persist in this mad purpose? I trust the vote on admitting Kansas will show that we can yet expect *justice* at their hands. If not, the consequences will rest upon them!

## FILLMORE AND HIS PRO-SLAVERYISM.

From the "New York Courier and Enquirer," August 30, 1856.

WE cannot well conceive of a more dishonest proceeding than that adopted by the Fillmore leaders at the North to secure votes for Fillmore in order to benefit Buchanan. To accomplish this disingenuous and disreputable purpose, it is everywhere proclaimed from the stump, at the North and East, that Fillmore is *opposed* to slavery-extension! But these declarations are confined to their speeches, and rarely do they find their way into print; because, at the South, Mr. Fillmore is supported on the avowed ground that he is as ultra a pro-slavery man as is Mr. Buchanan, and, equally with him, pledged to carry slavery into free territory, and to *veto* any and every bill restoring, directly or indirectly, the Missouri Compromise.

Up to June, 1855, the *Courier and Enquirer*—without our belonging to any lodge, and notwithstanding our hostility to secret meetings—went hand in hand with the American party in their hostility to the Naturalization Laws, believing as we did, and do, that their day of usefulness is past. But when the Americans met in Convention, in June, 1855, and deliberately adopted the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and the extension of slavery into Kansas and all the free Territories of the Union, as the 12th section of their platform,—and when, in addition, they made an assault on the religion of a portion of our naturalized and native citizens,—we indignantly repudiated all association with the very party of which we were the oldest and most indefatigable advocate in the United States.

The American Convention met in Philadelphia on the 12th of June, 1855; and, on the 13th, promulgated the platform from which we extract the following:—

"12. As experience has shown it impossible to reconcile opinions so extreme as those which separate the disputants, and as there can be

no dishonor in submitting to the laws, the National Council has deemed it the best guarantee of common justice and the future peace to *ABIDE BY and maintain THE EXISTING LAWS upon the subject of SLAVERY* [in KANSAS], as a *final and conclusive SETTLEMENT of that subject in spirit and in substance.*"

Here, then, the American Convention deliberately committed itself to adhere to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and the Nebraska act as it is, "*as a finality*;" and pledged all its members, and all whom it might nominate for office, to this infamous and disgraceful platform. The honest men of the Convention, who would not commit themselves to slavery-extension in free territory, and who had begged, implored, and entreated of the Convention not to meddle with the question of slavery, made one more vigorous effort to induce the Southern members to listen to reason; but it was all in vain. The South, with its characteristic arrogance, insisted upon the principle of slavery-extension; and thereupon the North, with few exceptions, *seceded in a body*. We, of course, from that day, severed all connection with what had become a pro-slavery and slavery-extension party; and we quote from our files on this subject:—

From the *Courier and Enquirer*, June 16, 1855.

"Our worst fears have been realized. The Convention has split on the rock of slavery. The rent is complete, and the whole concern, as a national organization, has gone to the bottom. \* \* \* \* \*

"Why did the majority, who assumed to act on national grounds, force an issue upon the Convention that was directly *sectional* in its character,—sure to split it into two sectional parts, and sure to turn the next presidential election into a purely *sectional* contest?

"We believe that we know something of the

temper of the North upon this repeal measure. From the very incipency of the scheme we did not fail to warn the South against it. We reasoned, we besought, we protested. In the most emphatic terms we could command, we did not hesitate to declare that it would arouse a storm of indignation at the North such as the country had never yet seen,—a storm which would scatter like chaff all the good effects of the Compromise of 1850, and commence a period of turmoil and discord the end of which no living man could foresee or conjecture. Our toil was for naught; yet every word that we said has, thus far, been verified in every letter. Let the elections throughout the entire North during the last sixteen months testify. To-day our first assurance is doubly sure that *the Northern States will never assent to the outrage involved in that deliberate violation of good faith.*"

From the *Courier and Enquirer*, June 18, 1855.

"Admitting, as a very large majority of the members of the Convention did, that the repeal of the Missouri Compromise was a great wrong and a disgraceful and dishonorable and dishonest act, they still have the *modesty* to declare that it is the *duty* of the people of the United States, upon whom this great wrong has been perpetrated, 'to abide by and maintain THE EXISTING LAWS upon the subject of slavery in Kansas, as a FINAL and CONCLUSIVE SETTLEMENT of that subject, in spirit and in substance'!! Individuals, or large or small bodies of men, have an unquestionable right to make fools of themselves whenever it is their interest so to do; but we deny their right to compel others to follow their example."

What, then, were the sentiments and principles of the American party one year ago admits of no question. They were ultra Southern; and the party was as thoroughly committed to slavery-extension as the Democracy ever were; and upon this committal the Southern Know Nothings in Congress, or South Americans, as they are called, acted together in the House during the election of a Speaker, and openly proclaimed themselves and their party as devotedly attached to Southern institutions as the Southern Democracy. Upon this declaration they sustained themselves until the meeting of the American National Convention in Philadelphia on the 22d of August last, for the purpose of nominating a candidate for the Presidency.

When that body assembled, the Northern members insisted that, before making any nomination for President, the slavery plank of their platform should be *repealed*. This, of course, was opposed by every Southern member of the Convention. The fight raged for hours—and, we believe, days—in suc-

cession. But the South,—true to itself and its principles,—with the aid of Northern dough-faces and the editors of the *New York Express*, VOTED DOWN the motion to repeal the slavery-extension pledge; and thereupon the honest men of the North WITHDREW FROM THE CONVENTION! *After their withdrawal, AND BY SOUTHERN VOTES, FILLMORE and DONELSON were put in nomination for the Presidency!!*

Nor is this all. This very Convention admitted to seats in their body *Roman Catholic* delegates from *Louisiana*, who voted for FILLMORE, and then covenanted that *Romanism* should be *tolerated* in all their Southern lodges, and that no person should be excluded from office in *the South*, under the *eighth plank* of their platform!!!

This is the history of FILLMORE's nomination; and the *Express* will not presume to deny it. And, if this be so, we ask of honest men of all parties, if Mr. FILLMORE is not as thoroughly pledged to slavery-extension as is Mr. BUCHANAN? Unquestionably he is; and, because so pledged, the South sustains him as an ultra pro-slavery and slavery-extension candidate. But a BUCHANAN press at the South quoted against Mr. FILLMORE his former abolition sentiments! How was this met? Mr. FILLMORE proclaimed, in his Albany speech, that the election of Col. FREMONT by the *free people* of the United States would and should induce the South to destroy the Union!\* Until then no Southern press had dared to advance the sentiment that the election of any candidate by the people, and according to the Constitution, would be cause for a dissolution of the Union; but when an Ex-President of the United States proclaimed this abominable doctrine, and virtually appealed to the South to secede from the Union if FREMONT were elected to the Presidency by the people of the United States, and assured them that in his judgment and the judgment of his friends it would be good cause for secession, the whole ultra Southern press responded to the appeal, and now, with one accord, insist that they will do so when the contingency arises.

Let these facts be widely circulated for the information of the people.

---

\* How different from the noble sentiments of Gen. HOUSTON, just uttered in the United States Senate:—

"They tell me," said the brave old man, "that if FREMONT is elected forty thousand bayonets will bristle about the Capitol; that the South, in fact, will secede. Mr. President, I scorn the suggestion! There will be neither bristling bayonets nor secession. If Colonel FREMONT shall be elected by a majority of the people, though I am not his supporter, I shall respect the majority of the people; and to Colonel FREMONT, as the Chief Magistrate of their choice, I shall pay my respectful homage."